

SECTION III—REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for a thorough review, and respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

Objection to the Oath/Declaration

The Office Action objected to the Oath/Declaration because it does not identify the citizenship of the inventor “Vladimir Sachenko.” Applicants submit concurrently herewith a corrected Declaration executed by inventor Vladimir Savchenko which shows his country of citizenship as Bulgaria and further corrects a misspelling of the inventor’s last name (“Sachenko” should be “Savchenko”).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the Declaration.

Objections to the Specification

Paragraph [0013]:

The Office Action objected to paragraph [0013] of the specification because it contained an embedded hyperlink, “www.eclipse.org.” In accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion, Applicants have redacted the embedded hyperlink as set forth in amendments to the specification in Section I above.

Paragraphs [0005] and [0006]:

The Office Action objected to paragraphs [0005] and [0006] of the specification because each makes reference to service “**registry**” 130 rather than service “**directory**” 130 as shown in

Figure 1 and elsewhere in the specification. In accordance with the Examiner's recommendation, Applicants have replaced all three occurrences of service "**registry**" with service "**directory**." Applicants respectfully submit that this change does not represent new subject matter, but rather corrects an erroneous typographical error.

Paragraph [0056]:

The Office Action objected to paragraph [0056] of the specification because makes reference to the term "SI" which is not defined within the specification. Applicants have removed the reference to the term "SI" from the specification.

In accordance with the amendments to paragraphs 5, 6, 13, and 56, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections to the specification.

Objection to claims 19 and 31

The Office Action objected to claims 19 and 31 because the trademark name "JAVA" was not capitalized or otherwise set apart to reflect the status of the term as a trademark. Applicants have capitalized the term "JAVA" in claims 19 and 31 in accordance with the Examiner's recommendation.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claims 19 and 31.

Claim 20-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Office Action rejected claims 20-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because "the claimed subject matter does not belong to any of the four statutory categories" Applicants have amended claim 20 to recite a "computing apparatus" in place of a "Web service client."

Applicants respectfully submit that a “computing apparatus” is a “manufacture,” and thus, claim 20 recites patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Dependent claims 21-33 have been amended in a similar manner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 20-33.

Claims 1-29, 31-38 and 40-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-29, 31-38 and 40-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over Sun Microsystems, “*Building Web Services - Sun™ ONE Studio 5 Programming Series*,” published in June 2003 (“Sun Web Services”). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1-19 and 41-48

In particular, independent claim 1 as amended herein recites in pertinent part:

... providing a client protocol implementation for the generated Web service client proxy ... and **setting a feature of the client protocol implementation** to define a behavior of the Web service **without regenerating the Web service client proxy**.

The Office Action states that Sun Web Services discloses, “setting a feature of the client protocol implementation ... without regenerating the Web service client proxy.” The Office Action relies on Sun Web Services at pages 95-101 which states in pertinent part: “The IDE lets you **edit the proxy source**, but if you regenerate the client in the IDE **your proxy source changes are not preserved**.” Refer to page 100, first paragraph. The reference goes on to state that by “Right-click[ing] the **client node** and choos[ing] **Properties**” and then “Chang[ing] the

Generate Presentation property to **False** ... [w]hen you generate the client, **only the client proxy classes are created.**" Refer to page 101, steps 2-3.

The Office Action therefore, appears to equate changing the "Generate Presentation property" of the "client node" with "setting a feature of the **client protocol implementation**" as claimed by Applicants and further equates not "regenerat[ing] the client in the IDE" with not "regenerating the Web service client proxy" as Applicants recite. However, the "**client node**" described by Sun Web Services is not the same as the "**client protocol implementation**" claimed by Applicants, and "**regenerating the client**," or avoiding doing so by changing the client's property, is not the same as "setting a feature of the **client protocol implementation** ... without regenerating the **Web service client proxy**," as Applicants have claimed.

Sun Web Services describes modifying the "proxy source" property of a client node and how to persist a "proxy source" property modification through generation, or regeneration of a "client node." The reference does not disclose "setting a feature of the **client protocol implementation** ... without regenerating the **Web service client proxy**," as Applicants recite in claim 1. Moreover, the process described by Sun Web Services does not even disclose a "Web service client proxy," and therefore cannot disclose a method where "a feature of the client protocol implementation" is changed "**without regenerating the Web service client proxy.**"

Because Sun Web Services fails to disclose each and every element in as complete detail as Applicants recite in claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Sun Web Services and is in condition for allowance. Independent claims 13, 41, and 45 recite similar limitations. Dependent claims 2-12, 14-19, 42-44, and 46-48 directly or indirectly incorporate all the limitations of the independent base claims upon which they depend, and thus,

for at least the reasons stated above, are not anticipated by Sun Web Services and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 20-29, 31-38, and 40

With respect to independent claim 20, the Office Action states that Sun Web Services discloses:

a protocol implementation coupled with the Web service client proxy to process a message ... the protocol implementation comprising **a security protocol implementation to provide a security service for the message.**

Refer to the Office Action at page 11, paragraph 4 which cites pages 189-214 of Sun Web Services, "Appendix A" in its entirety. The Appendix of Sun Web Services states in pertinent part:

JAX-RPC and the IDE support **HTTP Basic Authentication and HTTPS/SSL Authentication and Encryption**. This appendix provides an overview of the security technologies and describes how to use the IDE to implement the two kinds of security.

Refer to Sun Web Services, page 189. The following pages go on to describe how to configure IDE to implement the available "security technologies." However, the cited reference fails to disclose **"a protocol implementation coupled with the Web service client proxy ... comprising a security protocol implementation."** While Sun Web Services does disclose "security technologies," the reference does not teach or suggest that the "security technologies" are comprised within a "protocol implementation," or even associated with a "protocol implementation" in any way. In fact, Sun Web Services teaches away from Applicants stating that **"HTTP basic authentication applies to a web service as a whole."** The reference then further clarifies, stating that, **"[t]echnically, the authentication applies to the JAXRPC servlet that**

implements the web service.” Therefore, the “security technologies” described by Sun Web Services appear to be associated with particular JAXRPC servlets and not comprised within “a protocol implementation coupled with the **Web service client proxy**,” as Applicants recite.

Because Sun Web Services fails to disclose each and every element in as complete detail as Applicants recite in amended independent claim 20, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is not anticipated by Sun Web Services and is in condition for allowance. Independent claim 34, as amended, recites a similar limitation. Dependent claims 22-29, 31-33, 36-38, and 40 directly or indirectly incorporate all the limitations of the independent base claims upon which they depend, and thus, for at least the reasons stated above are not anticipated by Sun Web Services and are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 21 and 35 are canceled herein without prejudice, and thus, the rejection of claims 21 and 35 is rendered moot.

In accordance with the preceding remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 1-29, 31-38 and 40-48.

Claims 30 and 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 30 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun Web Services and further in view of Sun Microsystems, “Sun One Architecture Guide – Delivering Services on Demand,” published in 2002 (“Sun DSOD”).

Sun Web Services and Sun DSOD, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to disclose “a protocol implementation **coupled with the Web service client proxy ... comprising a security protocol implementation.**” Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above with respect to the rejection of independent claims 20 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Applicants

respectfully submit that dependent claims 30 and 39 are patentable over the references and in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 30 and 39.

CONCLUSION

Given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked subject matter in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such subject matter may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (503) 439-8778.

Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

/Gregory D. Caldwell/
Gregory D. Caldwell
Registration No. 39,926
Attorney for Applicants

Date: January 28, 2008

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone: (503) 439-8778
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073